CITY COUNCIL
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU
530 SOUTH KING STREET, ROOM 202
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-3065
TELEPHONE: (808) 768-5010 • FAX: (808) 768-5011

IKAIKA ANDERSON
Council Vice Chair
Councilmember, District 3
Email: ianderson@honolulu.gov
Phone: 808-768-5003
Fax: 808-768-1235

April 27, 2018

TO: Council Chair Ernie Martin

FROM: Councilmember Ikaika Anderson

SUBJECT: 2018 NACo Legislative Conference
Travel Report
Washington Hilton
1919 Connecticut Avenue,
Washington, DC 20009
March 1-8, 2018

2018 National Association of Counties (NACo) Legislative Conference
Washington Hilton
1919 Connecticut Avenue, Washington, DC 20009
March 1-8, 2018
Travel Report:

The NACo Legislative Conference, held annually in Washington, D.C., brings together over 2,000 elected and appointed county officials to focus on federal policy issues that impact counties and our residents. As a sitting member of the NACo Board of Directors, this was an opportunity to engage with legislators from rural and urban counties, from both large and small budgets to come together for education, networking and sessions designed to help improve our residents' lives and the efficiency of our county government.

The National Association of Counties (NACo) unites America's 3,069 county governments. Founded in 1935, NACo brings county officials together to advocate with a collective voice on national policy, exchange ideas and build new leadership skills, pursue transformational county solutions, enrich the public's understanding of county government and exercise exemplary leadership in public service. I attended the following meetings and events:

<u>Sunday, March 4, 2018</u>

1) HSAC Breakfast
    a. Meet and greet HSAC members, provide updates on conference and legislative priorities and goals.
    b. NACo Vice Presidential candidates attended to discuss opportunities and issues with HSAC membership.

2) Large Urban County Caucus
    a. The National Association of Counties (NACo) Large Urban County Caucus, or "LUCC," is a bipartisan caucus, LUCC meets in conjunction with the NACo Legislative Conference in Washington, D.C. each winter and at the NACo Annual Conference in July. Its annual Symposium, held in the fall, is emerging as the must-attend event for LUCC members to engage with influencers and innovators from world class philanthropic organizations, think tanks, academic institutions and businesses, to foster creative and new public/private collaborations and partnerships. Officials from NACo member counties with populations over 500,000 are eligible to participate in LUCC. LUCC is led by a steering committee with a chair and vice chair, all appointed by the NACo president on an annual basis. LUCC is the premier forum for urban county leaders and is the voice for

America's metropolitan counties before Congress and the Administration. Comprised of county executives, governing board members and other senior elected officials, LUCC members focus on urban challenges and solutions, engage in peer-to-peer information exchanges and informal national policy discussions.

b. Panel Discussion: Cultivating Inclusive Growth and Development in Urban Counties: At the outset of 2018, unemployment rates in the U.S. are at a 17-year low and the economy is adding new jobs at an impressive rate – and much of this growth is powered by large urban centers throughout the nation. Nonetheless, in many metropolitan counties, healthy national indicators belie a more complicated and uneven economic picture at the local level. During this session, national thought-leaders will join officials from large urban counties to discuss how local decision-makers can look beyond simple indicators to measure the true economic well-being of their communities and help to drive policies and partnerships that foster inclusive urban growth and development.

c. Increasing Urban Counties' Preparedness for Disasters through Federal-Local Partnership: FEMA's Protection and National Preparedness directorate is charged with coordinating preparedness and protection- related activities throughout the agency, including grants, trainings, exercises and assessments that help urban counties better prepare for disasters. Acting Deputy Administrator Katie Fox will join us to provide an overview of FEMA's preparedness-related initiatives and programs – including grant programs of importance to urban counties – and to engage with LUCC members about how the federal government can best partner with local jurisdictions to prepare America's urban areas for natural and man-made disasters.

d. Overview of the Trump Administration's Infrastructure Plan: The Trump Administration introduced a long-awaited set of "expanded-principles" on infrastructure, outlining a vision for a new 10-year, $1.5 trillion federal infrastructure package. Although the final details of any infrastructure package signed into law will be drafted by Congressional leaders, the Administration's outline provides the pillars on which such a package will likely be built.

3) Resilient and Healthy Counties Lunch: Strengthening Counties Resilience by Addressing the Public Health Impacts of Natural Disasters:

a. Recognizing that counties need to be prepared for public health needs before, during and after natural disasters strike, this session will focus on strategies for creating a resilient county public health system. County elected officials must work with health and emergency management departments to prepare for and appropriately respond to public health issues. In this session, county leaders will share how they have responded to past disasters and how they are making changes today to mitigate future impacts.

b. In order to remain healthy, vibrant and safe, America's counties must continue to strengthen their resiliency by building leadership capacity to better identify and manage risk. In 2017, there were 16 disaster events across the U.S. that resulted in losses exceeding $1 billion, including: 8 severe storms, 3 tropical cyclones, 2 floods, an extreme drought, a freeze and a major wildfire. In total, these events resulted in significant fatalities and economic losses: 362 people died, double the disaster-related death toll from last year; and over $306 billion in total damage was caused, $265 billion of which is attributed to Hurricanes Harvey, Irma and Maria. In total, 813 counties were declared major disaster sites at least once by the federal government in 2017. Disasters like these have a profound impact on the long-term public health of a community. It is critically important for county health departments to coordinate closely with their local offices of emergency management, as well as federal and state partners, to develop emergency and recovery plans that ensure the delivery of public health and medical services during a disaster. There are numerous factors for which county public health departments should plan, including but not limited to: lack of access to local hospitals; hospital and other first responder staff working overtime and/or unable to make it into work; lost or destroyed medications; food and pharmaceutical shortages; water and/or sewage treatment plants losing power or discharging untreated sewage; and the acute vulnerability of certain residents. Low income, disabled, elderly, immigrant, and chronically ill populations tend to be most adversely affected in disaster situations. They are typically the most impacted when access to critical treatment (dialysis, breathing machines, etc.) is lost, the most stressed during evacuation and temporary relocation, and most under-prepared due lack of resources (insurance, mobility, alternative shelter, etc.). It is important for counties to understand those compounding effects. During the disaster recovery process, counties should prioritize managing basic health and safety concerns.vi In the short term, the most pressing concerns for county health departments are the prevention of potential injury and mortality due to a range of challenges, including: antibiotic resistant staph infections; flesh-eating bacteria; infection due to exposure to raw sewage or contaminated water; exposure to mold and mildew; increased mosquitos; and respiratory infections. In the long term, the major concern is to ensure the positive mental health of residents. Disasters and their associated aftereffects often lead to greater prevalence of post-traumatic stress disorder, higher risk of alcohol and substance use and depression due to the loss of life and property and the challenge of coping with injuries sustained during the event.

c. Oklahoma County, Oklahoma: is one of the most disaster-prone counties in the United States. The county contains 14 municipalities and 22% of the state's population. It has experienced 23 declared disasters in the last decade and 42 since 1964—the year that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) began collecting disaster declaration data at the county-level. The county has been hit by, and recovered from, almost every type of emergency and disaster situation. The county has experienced 14 severe storms, 13 fires, 7 severe ice storms, 4 floods, 2 tornadoes, 1 hurricane, 1 human-caused event – the Oklahoma City bombing – and has started to experience earthquakes, although not yet at a magnitude that has led to a disaster. While disaster response had always been part of the county health department's activities, it was the 1995 bombing that catalyzed the county's active focus on public health emergency preparedness. Since 1995, OCCHD has built a strong emergency preparedness and response department which takes advantage of its robust federal, state and local partnerships. At the federal level, the county has strong relationships with both FEMA and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) – which administers several public health emergency preparedness funding streams. If the overall goal of public health preparedness is to minimize the effects of disaster events on county residents and vital county utilities and facilities, it is imperative that counties have the proper plans and partnerships in place. Preparedness is a continuous process that requires regular evaluation and updating of local plans, procedures and protocols to reflect any changes to the county's current physical and organizational environment. To ensure prompt and comprehensive coverage of county needs during a disaster, always remember to coordinate with local community partners (e.g. other local jurisdictions, Voluntary Organizations Active in Disaster and faith-based organizations) and leading national response agencies (e.g. FEMA and the Red Cross).

d. Harris County, Texas: Harris County Texas is home to over 4.5 million residents, making it the third most populous county in the United States. The area is prone to flood events, with at least 1 major event occurring every two years, dating back as early as the 1800s. Harris County Public Health (HCPH) is the primary agency responsible for protecting the public's health in the event of a widespread public health emergency. The department employs 700 public health professionals, and sees over 100,000 patients across 16 wellness clinics & WIC sites. HCPH has historically responded to public health issues such as rabies, mosquito-borne illnesses, air and water pollution, disease outbreaks, water and food-borne illnesses, tuberculosis, polio, and other communicable diseases. However, emerging challenges in the field, such as the increased severity of flooding and other natural disasters have activated a widened scope of responsibility. In the long term, recovery through monitoring of physical and mental health impacts and investments in public health infrastructure and capacity will be necessary. While it is estimated that the probability of another event with the incredible magnitude of Hurricane Harvey's rainfall occurring in any given year is extremely low (less than 0.01 percent change of annual occurrence), the Harris County Public Health Department is working to prepare and equip its residents for the next public health disaster and future health emergencies.

e. Sonoma County, California: The Sonoma County Departments of Health and Human Services are committed to protecting and supporting the health, safety and well-being of individuals, families and the community through a broad range of innovative programs and services. A major priority of the departments is preparedness to ensure quick and effective response to disasters. Sonoma County Departments of Health and Human Services learned two main lessons from their response to the county's 2017 fires. First, the value of mutual aid cannot be overstated. With the overwhelming number of residents in need of county services – and the number of county staff among those affected, it would have been impossible for the county to respond efficiently and effectively without outside help. Realizing this, the county enlisted local nonprofits and fellow California counties to help provide medical and social services. Seeing the value of mutual aid firsthand, the county now plans to put formal agreements in place to streamline its response even further. Second, training is vital to effective response. If leadership and staff do not understand the incident management structure and know their role in a disaster, the county's ability to respond is hampered from the beginning. Everyone needs to have a role – even if that role is to maintain regular service – but at the same time everyone must be flexible and nimble as needs and circumstances change. For example, the Sonoma County main administrative campus and two of its three hospitals were mandatory evacuation sites for the duration of the fires. As a result, the Department of Human Services administrative office, which was not evacuated and had a backup generator for power, became the operations center for the department and any other County staff who needed a space to work. During this time, county staff were mobilized across the county and to keep track of them the county instituted twice daily check-ins – once in the morning and once in the evening – to inventory staff and programs. Without proper training and protocols, the county would not have been able to provide service as effectively as it did.

4) Western Interstate Region (WIR) Board of Directors Meeting
   a. The Western Interstate Region is affiliated with the National Association of Counties and is dedicated to the promotion of Western interests within NACo. These interests include public land issues (use and conservation), community stability and economic development, and the promotion of the traditional Western way of life. Its membership consists of fifteen Western states, (Alaska, Hawaii, Wash., Ore., Calif., Idaho, Nev., Ariz., Mont., Wyo., Colo., N.M., Utah, N.D., S.D.) with membership funded through the individual state associations.
   b. A Conversation with the Chief of the U.S. Forest Service: Tony Tooke was sworn in as the 18th Chief of the U.S. Forest Service on September 1st. Chief Tooke will speak to the WIR Board of Directors about ways his agency would like to engage with county governments to achieve mutual goals of good stewardship of our natural resources, ensuring access to public lands and the creation of good-paying jobs.
   c. Rural Development in the 21st Century: The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Office of Rural Development offers loans, grants and loan guarantees to help create jobs and support economic development and essential services such as housing, health care, first responder services and equipment, and water, electric and communications infrastructure in rural America. USDA California State Director for Rural Development and former Colusa County Supervisor Kim

Dolbow Vann will speak about the administration's plans for rural development and how USDA can work with counties on economic development issues.

d. How Can Rural Counties Strengthen Local Economies? Discussed community best practices, as well as tools, assistance and events available to counties from NACo's Community Resilience & Economic Development programs, specifically including programming and assistance targeted to coal-reliant communities of the West.
e. The Impact of the Tourism Economy in the West: The tourism economy creates thousands of jobs, and generates billions of dollars in economic activity in Western states. Each state represented within WIR is also a member of the Western States Tourism Policy Council, which seeks to support policies that promote greater tourism in the West. Mr. David Wetmore will speak about the WSTPC's latest activities and discuss how we can work together to grow the tourism economy.

5) NACo Board Forum
    a. Discussed various Board business, issues and concerns.
    b. Counties Addressing Poverty:
        i. The official measure of poverty is established by the White House Office of Management and Budget (OMB) and is adjusted annually by the U.S. Census Bureau to reflect inflation
        ii. The average poverty threshold for a family of four in 2015 was $24,257
        iii. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, in 2015, 13.5 percent of all Americans fell under the federal poverty line.
        iv. The number of people living in poverty: 43.1 Million people, is roughly equal to the entire population of the 23 least-populated states combined.
        v. In 2015, 20% of Counties had poverty rates above 20.8%
    c. Counties working to create pathways out of poverty:
        i. Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) was created in 1996 and replaced the Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC) program. The program has four broad goals: providing cash assistance to needy families so that children can be cared for in their own homes; reducing the dependency of needy parents by promoting job preparation, work and marriage; preventing and reducing unplanned pregnancies among single young adults; and encouraging the formation and maintenance of two-parent families. Although TANF is an entitlement program disbursed to states, counties in ten states administer TANF benefits: California, Colorado, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Virginia and Wisconsin. In county-administered states, counties share in the administrative and maintenance of effort costs of TANF. Families receiving TANF in the ten county-administered states make up 51 percent of the total TANF population. Roughly $8.5 billion in TANF funds – out of the total $16 billion program – are sent to those ten county-administered states each year.

ii. Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) provides nutrition assistance to millions of low- income individuals and families through benefits loaded on an electronic benefits transfer (EBT) card. Similar to TANF, SNAP benefits are county-administered in the following states: California, Colorado, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Virginia and Wisconsin. In these states, counties often contribute substantial local funds to administrative and supplemental costs of running the program.
iii. Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) is designed to intercept the root causes of poverty. It is one of the most flexible federal block grants: 99 percent of CSBG funds are passed down to community action agencies (CAAs), which are responsible for determining the most pressing needs in their community – ranging from employment to affordable housing to health care – and administering the funding to applicable programs to address those needs. In FY 2013, 168 counties in 28 states and the District of Columbia invested $112.8 million of CSBG funds. Local elected officials or their representatives must by law make up one-third of each CAA's board of directors. With over 1,000 CAAs nationwide, county officials play an integral part in determining how CSBG funding is used.
iv. Social Services Block Grant (SSBG) SSBG funds are distributed to states and can be used for nearly 30 different activities – such as adult and child protective services – to help and safeguard vulnerable populations. Like CSBG, this array of services makes it one of the most flexible federal block grants. In FY 2014, the last year for which data is available, SSBG served 30 million individuals, 44 percent of whom were children. While counties across the country utilize SSBG for various programs, SSBG funds are county-administered in the following states: Colorado, Minnesota, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Virginia and Wisconsin. Counties in these ten states determine the best use of SSBG funding based on their own local needs: NACo conducted a survey in 2012 that revealed that counties most commonly use SSBG for adult and child protective services. In FY 2015, 796 counties in 29 states and the District of Columbia invested over $763 million in SSBG funds.
v. Child Care Development Block Grant (CCDBG) CCDBG helps low-income families, families receiving public assistance (such as TANF) and families transitioning from public assistance
in obtaining child care. CCDBG includes provisions to help develop the social- emotional health of children, including combatting the effects of expulsion from early care and screenings for cognitive or developmental delays. Many states pass the responsibilities of delivering child care assistance down to counties, meaning those counties must comply with federal mandates for child care programs. In addition to complying with federal guidelines, counties must focus on the administration of benefits to families in their communities. In FY 2013, at least 438 counties in 23 states invested $939 million in federal CCDBG funds. Counties use these

funds to supplement assistance to families in the TANF program and serve other low-income families. Additionally, counties can distribute funds to families to select their own child care programs or establish baseline health and safety protections within child care programs receiving CCDBG funds. Counties supplement CCDBG funding with other state and local resources. The top 5 states in terms of CCDBG amounts invested by counties are New York, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, Florida and Ohio.

vi. Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting Program (MIECHV) The maternal, infant and early childhood home visitation program provides in-home support to pregnant women, newborn babies and families with children up to five years old. The program helps parents of at-risk children from birth to kindergarten ensure their children are physically, socially and emotionally healthy and ready to learn. In particular, this work boosts early childhood development and enhances childhood trauma prevention efforts. Although states are the primary recipient of home visitation program funding, resources are often passed on from states to counties to operate local programs. Counties either employ public health nurses to conduct visits or contract with local social service nonprofits to provide these services. Counties operate two types of home visitation programs: general public health visits for mothers and newborns and targeted visits to high-risk families as identified by research approved by HHS.

vii. Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act (WIOA) is designed to strengthen and improve the U.S. workforce system and help individuals get and retain high-quality jobs. In particular, WIOA targets the long-term unemployed, dislocated workers and disconnected youth. WIOA has six broad goals, including reducing welfare dependency and increasing access to training and education. WIOA funding is directed to local workforce development boards (WDBs). Counties are involved in 90 percent of the country's local WDBs, participating in the development of plans and local partnerships, managing special resources, appointing and certifying the local WDB, or a combination of all three. 28 percent of WDBs operate directly within a county government.

viii. Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) was enacted in 1974 to provide funding for community development programs. The program assists urban, suburban and rural communities in improving housing and living conditions and expanding economic opportunities for low and moderate income individuals. CDBG helps create jobs through the expansion and retention of businesses and is an important tool for helping local governments tackle serious challenges facing their communities. Grants are provided to counties on a formula basis: 70 percent of CDBG funds go to cities and counties, while 30 percent go to states. Counties use the flexibility of CDBG funds to meet their particular community needs and to partner with the private and nonprofit sectors to develop and upgrade local housing, water and infrastructure projects and human services programs. Currently, 185 "entitlement counties" receive

CDBG funds directly, while "non-entitlement counties" must compete for funding via the state formula allocation.

d. Take Action:
    i. County officials should encourage their federal lawmakers to enhance and preserve a number of critical federal programs in the fight to reduce poverty.
    ii. Counties often must comply with state and federal mandates, yet are hampered in their ability to raise revenue. Federal support for local anti-poverty programs is critical.
    iii. Consistent and continued support for federal programs like SSBG, CSBG and CCDBG helps counties serve those most in need and aid individuals and families in breaking the cycles of poverty.
    iv. Federal lawmakers should consider local officials key stakeholders and partners as they work to update and reform programs like TANF and SNAP.

Monday, March 5, 2018

1) General Session: White House Infrastructure Package Analysis:
    a. On February 12, 2018, the Trump Administration introduced long-awaited "expanded principles" outlining a vision for a new 10-year, $1.5 trillion federal infrastructure package. These principles, titled "Legislative Outline for Rebuilding Infrastructure in America," expand upon the "Infrastructure Initiative" white paper that accompanied President Trump's FY 2018 budget back in February of 2017. The administration has stated that this document is open to revisions by Congress as they look to craft legislation based off the administration's principles. As counties own 46 percent of the nation's roads, 38 percent of the nation's bridges and are involved in over one- third of the nation's airports and transit systems, increased attention from the White House is a welcome development. Counties invest over $122 billion each year in construction, maintenance and rehabilitation of the nation's infrastructure network, but cannot address the substantial project backlog without a strong partnership with and assistance from the federal government. The White House's infrastructure plan is comprised mainly of several new initiatives, modifications to existing programs and regulatory reform. Overall, the plan calls for $200 billion in new federal spending, with the goal of leveraging those dollars to yield a total of $1.5 trillion in new spending and financing for infrastructure projects

across the country. New spending under the plan would be broken down according to the chart below:

b. The Plan Would Create New Grant Programs and Federal Funding Opportunities, but Require Local and State Governments to Provide Additional Funding:

    i. The plan would allocate $100 billion towards grants for infrastructure improvements. The first and largest financial component of the plan is a new "Incentives Program," which would provide funding support to a wide-range of assets, including the following governmental public infrastructure: surface transportation and airports, passenger rail, ports and waterways, flood control, water supply, hydropower, water resources, drinking water facilities, wastewater facilities, storm water facilities, and Brownfields and Superfund sites.

    ii. Of note for counties, this new grant money does come with restrictions. Specifically, the plan states "an incentive grant could not exceed 20 percent of new revenue," therefore requiring state and local governments to increase their share of a project's cost. This would call for a fundamental change in traditional funding models existing in current surface transportation and infrastructure authorizations, which include federal government contribution levels up to 80 percent.

        Applications for funding will be evaluated on objective criteria, with priority largely based on how much non- federal revenue an applicant can secure for the project, with priority given to those who can provide more funds, along with other financial, technological and innovation considerations. While county governments would be able to apply for these funds directly, the local funding requirement will limit the number of counties that are able to secure funding, as they may not meet the criteria required to be considered.

        Additionally, this funding will have a "look-back period," designed to allow projects already in motion the opportunity to take part in this new program. As this is a competitive grant program, no single state can be eligible for more than 10 percent, or $10 billion.

    iii. The plan allocates $50 billion for rural infrastructure projects: The second component of this package comes in the form of two new grant programs for rural infrastructure, one competitive and one formula-based. Both grants would be administered by state governors, with wide discretion granted to those governors as to where funding would go. Unlike the incentives program referenced above, local governments would not be eligible to apply directly to the federal government for this program. This fund would be available to "rural areas of populations less than 50,000 residents," and could be used for various projects, including transportation, broadband, water resources, stormwater and wastewater infrastructure, and power and electric facilities.

        The formula component of the rural infrastructure section would be, according to the document, calculated based on rural lane miles and rural population adjusted to reflect policy objectives. For the performance grants section, states would be required to meet certain requirements, including publishing a rural infrastructure investment plan within 180 days of receiving funds and meeting certain financial benchmarks. The rural component also has a set aside for tribal infrastructure, though no specific dollar amount is listed.

iv. The plan allocates $20 billion for "transformative" projects: The third component of the plan covers "transformative projects." Transformative projects would be designed to be "bold, innovative and transformative" projects that could dramatically improve infrastructure. $20 billion has been designated for investment in these projects, with funding allocated to cover as much as 80 percent of a project's cost for demonstration, planning and capital construction. This program, which would not restrict state or local governments from applying, would be administered by the U.S. Department of Commerce.

v. The Plan Would Expand and Modify a Number of Existing Financing Programs: In addition to the grant element of the plan, there are numerous financing measures outlined in the package. According to the document, existing lending programs, typically utilized for infrastructure finance, have been enhanced to improve state and local government's ability to apply for these funds. These changes, spread across four programs, would receive new funding totaling $14 billion.

vi. The plan would expand the Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation lending program (TIFIA): Under the president's plan, additional budget authority would be made available to USDOT for subsidy costs under TIFIA. Additionally, TIFIA could be used for airport, waterway and port projects, new areas of infrastructure previously not available through this widely used infrastructure mechanism. Counties utilize the TIFIA loan program for infrastructure projects, taking advantage of loans with favorable interest rates.

vii. The plan would expand the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation lending program (WIFIA): Under the president's proposal, additional budget authority would be made available to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the current lending limit ($3.2 billion) would be removed. Additionally, the program eligibility would be expanded from "community water systems" to "water systems," allowing drinking water providers to be able to apply for WIFIA loans. Furthermore, WIFIA would also be able to be applied towards water system acquisitions and restructuring. Brownfields site rehabilitation would also be eligible to utilize the WIFIA program under this plan.

viii. The plan would expand the Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement lending program (RRIF): Previously ineligible, short-line freight and passenger rail can now apply for RRIF loans. RRIF loans are currently underused and expanding this program could allow for new investments within the rail sector.

ix. The plan would expand the U.S. Department of Agriculture Rural Utilities Service lending program (RUS): Although the plan does not provide specifics, it would increase budget authority for the lending program. RUS administers programs that provide much-needed infrastructure or infrastructure improvements to rural communities.

x. The plan would also provide $6 billion to expand the scope of projects eligible for Private Activity Bonds (PABs): Under this part of their finance portion, new categories would be eligible for this financing instrument, including new construction of hydroelectric power facilities, flood control and stormwater facilities, many of which are owned by counties, as well as rural broadband facilities. Brownfields and Superfund sites may also utilize PABs under the plan to cover environmental remediation costs.

xi. The plan calls for the elimination of the Alternative Minimum Tax on PABs, as well as removing volume caps on PABs currently imposed on states.

xii. The plan includes new provisions for tax-exempt municipal bonds: Change-of-use provisions within the plan would allow for greater flexibility when private dollars are part of a project and bond proposal. The administration hopes that this will attract greater private sector investment.

xiii. Other financing recommendations include the expansion of state infrastructure banks and allowing small- hub airports to utilize the Passenger Facilities Charge (PFC) more easily. PFC's, a fee (currently $4.50) included on each leg of an airline ticket, are utilized by county-owned airports to fund airport construction projects.

xiv. The plan would create a new Capital Financing Fund: The plan addresses an accounting and funding issue that pertains to the federal government purchasing real property. Currently, the federal government must have an entire amount of purchase price appropriated and scored before a transaction could take place. To remedy this, a "revolving fund to finance purchases of federally owned civilian real property" would be established. $10 billion has been allocated for this fund, which would require repayment over 15 annual payments by discretionary appropriations from Congress.

xv. The Plan Focuses Heavily on Regulatory Streamlining and Reform and Transfers Additional Regulatory Responsibility to States
In addition to the funding and financing components mentioned above, the president's infrastructure plan focuses on regulatory reform. This is important to counties as regulatory hurdles and bureaucratic red-tape can increase project costs exponentially while causing major delays in project

completion. Some of these reforms will originate at the federal level and some will be delegated to States.

xvi. The administration plans to introduce a "one agency, one decision" environmental review structure under which a lead federal agency would assume authority to greenlight permitting processes: The president's plan calls for this to occur working collaboratively – not sequentially – with all other pertinent agencies to reach one decision before signing off. The plan calls for this process to take no longer than 21 months, with actual permits issued within 3 months after. This would equal the two-year maximum time for permit processes, reflecting a goal of the administration to shrink that timeline from what can sometimes be ten and even 20 years long.

xvii. The plan will require a single environmental review document and a single record of decision (ROD) coordinated by the lead agency: This would result in having one ROD for each project, rather than having numerous ROD's on any given project. Additionally, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) reviews would not need to be completed before undertaking certain tasks, such as the installation of certain small cells and wi-fi infrastructure. Rail right-of-way executions would also be permitted before relevant NEPA reviews are conducted under the plan.

xviii. The plan calls reduced duplication and increased flexibility in establishing and using categorical exclusions (CE): These exclusions are important to counties as they allow for quicker completion of projects by having certain NEPA requirements waived for smaller scale projects. NACo championed CE provisions in both MAP- 21 and FAST Act reauthorization bills for federal surface transportation projects.

xix. The plan directs the Council on Economic Quality (CEQ) to issue new regulations designed to streamline the NEPA process: NACo has met with CEQ numerous times over the past year, recognizing the footprint the White House would have in environmental streamlining. This plan solidifies CEQ as a leading agency tasked with crafting the administration's regulatory plan.

xx. The plan seeks to streamline regulations for highways: Most notably, the plan states its desire to authorize utility relocation to take place prior to NEPA review completion. Other assistance is provided by reclassifying the threshold for large projects to $1 billion, allowing for smaller projects to navigate the regulatory landscape more quickly.

xxi. The plan requests reforms to certain parts of the Clean Air Act and Federal Power Act: These reforms are offered with the goal of reducing inefficiencies, duplication, and uncertainty across regulatory efforts. The plan's goal is also to steer U.S. Army Corp of Engineer projects away from EPA and NEPA regulations, redirecting them to the Secretary of the Army. Further, certain regulatory and environmental review responsibilities are delegated to the states under the plan.

xxii. The plan sets to expand the current USDOT program of NEPA delegation and to include all sub-agencies: Currently, memorandums of understanding only exist between six states, a number this plan would like to see increased. While the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) are the only superagencies participating in this, the plan calls for all DOT sub agencies to participate as well.

xxiii. The plan instructs FHWA to delegate certain responsibilities for approving right-of-way acquisitions to states. Counties could benefit from this as it removes a sometimes duplicative process that causes delays and increased costs waiting for federal approvals.

xxiv. The plan also calls for USDOT to assign to states the responsibility to assume "project-level transportation conformity determinations regarding flood plain protections and noise policies as part of the NEPA assignment program": These actions would hasten project implementation and delivery. Counties could be beneficiaries to such a reform, eliminating a time barrier in the review process. Less time waiting equals financial savings for projects.

xxv. Other Provisions to Incentivize and Remove Barriers to Infrastructure Development: In addition to the funding components of the plan, the Trump Administration also offered guidance on reforms to various modes of transport and infrastructure:

xxvi. The transit portion of the plan seeks to improve conditions to attract private-sector investment in mass transit: The plan will require value capturing financing as a requirement to obtain Capital Investment Grants from the federal government. Value Capture is the process of retaining some percentage of the value provided in every transaction. While this can assist local governments in the rehabilitating existing transit components, this could potentially make it more difficult to obtain funds to build new infrastructure.

xxvii. The plan aims to streamline FAST Act provisions that restrict the time frame for legal claims for rail projects: The law currently allows for two years to bring forth litigation, while the administration's plan would shrink that timetable to 150 days. This would be done in hopes of expediting rail project delivery and involve all rail projects regardless of lead federal agency.

xxviii. The plan provides guidance on reforms within the Airport Improvement Program (AIP) to permit additional financial incentive payments: This new guidance would increase work efficiency and reduce project completion times. The AIP is vital to county owned airports' ability to make critical safety improvements to their airport facilities.

xxix. The plan addresses regulatory requirements for water programs, inland waterways and water infrastructure resources: These changes are geared toward streamlining regulatory requirements and increasing flexibility, expanding funding streams, and allowing for longer-term contracts with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

xxx. The proposal aims to address Brownfields and Superfund reforms by amending the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act to include a fund to facilitate new investment into Superfund cleanup and reuse. The plan does not state whether Brownfields and Superfund relief funds would be one or two separate programs.

xxxi. The proposal would provide regulatory relief for counties: These reforms would provide liability relief for state and local governments that acquire brownfields through involuntary means (i.e. tax delinquency, bankruptcy, abandonment, etc.), assume ownership of these properties and help fund and expedite clean-up and redevelopment efforts and create flexibility in funding and streamline the approval process. This would allow more brownfields to be redeveloped in a cost-effective and effective way.

xxxii. Pilot programs are also introduced within this plan: All designed to expedite the environmental review process and allow for quicker project completion. A performance based pilot as well as a negotiated mitigation pilot are listed as areas for testing within the plan. The performance based pilot would aim to replace "environmental impacts" with "environmental performance measures." The negotiated Mitigation Pilot would "experiment with negotiation of mitigation as an alternative decision-making process in lieu of NEPA.

xxxiii. The plan calls for Judicial reform dealing with the statute of limitations of permits needed to fulfil NEPA requirements: Reforms are designed to provide injunctive relief as well as address current issues arising from statute of limitation expiration of infrastructure permits and how they pertain to certain NEPA requirements. These delays are known to cause substantial delays, costing billions of dollars across the country.

xxxiv. Tolling restrictions are relaxed: The plan allows states flexibility in what toll-generated revenue can be utilized for as well as allowing existing lanes to be tolled, which is currently prohibited under law.

xxxv. The plan allows for the ability of states to commercialize interstate rest areas: This would, under the plan, allow for additional revenue generation by either operating, privatizing or contracting commercial activities at rest stops.

xxxvi. The plan calls for the elimination of duplicative reviews of historic property impacts for transportation projects: Currently, two provisions, one the National Historic Preservation Act and another in the FAST Act, inadvertently require essentially the same historic impact review to occur twice. The President's plan eliminates the FAST Act language creating the redundancy.

xxxvii. The plan calls for a new fund for public lands infrastructure: The proposed plan calls for the creation of an Interior Maintenance Fund for infrastructure development on public lands, allowing half of additional receipts generated by expanded federal energy development to be deposited into the fund. This would help the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) to address its deferred maintenance backlog, especially at national parks. Such receipts would be deposited into the fund until the cumulative amount deposited had reached $18 billion. The plan would also allow funds arising from the sale of government buildings to go towards infrastructure.

xxxviii. The plan would reform Pell Grant eligibility: The plan's reforms are centered around existing financial assistance mechanisms from current federal programs to promote career and technical training. Pell Grant eligibility would be expanded, with the administration stating the plan "would allow individuals to use Pell Grants to pay for short-term programs that lead to a credential or certification in an in-demand field."

xxxix. The plan would also expand career and technical education training: This is designed to address workforce needs in an ever-changing, more technologically advanced workplace. The plan would direct funding to high schools to promote and expand apprenticeships, work-based learning, and dual-enrollment; support evidence-based STEM and other Career Technical Education (CTE) offerings related to in-demand industry sectors; allow states to pool funds to support partnerships between local businesses and community stakeholders, and authorize funding for programs that prepare high school graduates for jobs rebuilding America's infrastructure. Finally, this section of the plan aims to empower workers by reforming licensing requirements for out-of-state workers seeking jobs on an infrastructure project.

As Congress begins to write legislation building upon the principles document the President has issued, counties look forward to working with our federal partners to ensure any infrastructure package preserves the federal-state-local partnership.

2) Building Citizen Buy-In:

a. County government management and operations rely on citizen engagement for many reasons, including votes on bond proposals and tax increases, input on budget proposals and key advisory boards. This workshop will focus on more ways counties can harness and increase citizen engagement in overall operations and management, validating decision-making and working effectively as a community. This workshop covers using social media to rapidly mobilize a community, successful messaging and other public outreach tools.

b. Effective county governance relies on citizen engagement through actions such as votes on bond proposals, input on budget proposals and participation on key advisory boards. Counties excel in harnessing the involvement of their citizenry in decision-making to work effectively as a community. Developing successful messaging, using social media and implementing other public outreach tools are a few ways in which county officials engage with their residents.

   c. Transparency is key along each step of the way. Being transparent creates trust and helps answer citizens' questions and concerns. Having the public's trust is necessary to establish credibility for the proposed action and get approval at the ballot. • Partner with stakeholders to reach out to the community. Collaborating with other governments, nonprofits and business groups helps with outreach efforts. These partners expand the outreach, educate the public and respond to any false claims made by opponents. • Meet your residents where they are. Engage residents across your entire jurisdiction to ensure that your message reaches everyone. Hold meetings throughout the community or involve the media to help promote the action needed.
   d. Gaining trust and approval from residents is critical for counties in these fiscally-lean times. This process — though necessary — can be difficult in an environment marked by eroding levels of trust in government. As Ms. Baker, Mr. Keith and Mr. Montplaisir detailed, transparency, education and engagement are all critical to build trust between citizens and their county government.

3) Attendee Luncheon
   a. Capitol Steps event: This one-of-a-kind troupe began as a group of Senate staffers who set out to satirize the very people and places that employed them. Although not all of the current performers are former Hill staffers, taken together, they have worked in a total of 18 congressional offices and represent more than six decades of House and Senate staff experience.

4) NACo Board of Directors meeting
   a. Legislative Priorities:
      i. Promote County Infrastructure Priorities: NACo will work with the Administration and Congress to ensure that any infrastructure package, including reauthorization of the Water Resources Development Act and the Highway Trust Fund, reflects the following county priorities: allocating more funding for locally owned infrastructure, increasing local decision-making authority and prioritizing investments that increase economic development, mobility and safety.
      ii. Support the Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) and Secure Rural Schools (SRS) Programs: NACo supports restoring full mandatory funding for the Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT) program, which compensates counties for untaxable federal land within their boundaries. NACo also supports extending the Secure Rural Schools (SRS) program as a transitional funding mechanism until the federal government fully implements a

sustainable long-term forest management program with adequate revenue sharing for forest counties and schools.

iii. Support Policies to Promote Mental Health, Substance Abuse Treatment and Justice Reform: NACo supports measures that enhance the ability of counties to pre- vent and treat mental illness and substance use disorders, both in the community and within the context of the criminal justice system. NACo also supports programs and legislation that divert non-violent individuals struggling with mental illness and/or substance use disorders from jails and into treatment programs while protecting overall public safety.

iv. Protect the Federal-State-Local Partnership for Medicaid: NACo supports protecting the federal-state-local partnership structure for financing and delivering Medicaid services while maximizing flexibility to support local systems of care. Counties are concerned about measures that would further shift Medicaid costs to counties, including proposals to institute block grants or per capita caps. These proposals would increase the amount of uncompensated care provided by counties and reduce counties' ability to provide for the health of our residents. NACo also supports targeted e orts to enhance flexibility in the program to support local systems of care, including easing Medicaid's Institute of Mental Diseases (IMD) and inmate exclusions.

v. Work Towards a More Effective Definition of Waters of the US.: NACo believes that local streets, gutters and human-made ditches should be excluded from the definition of "Waters of the U.S." (WOTUS) under the federal Clean Water Act. NACo calls on Congress to require the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to withdraw the new WOTUS rule and to rewrite it in consultation and collaboration with state and local governments.

vi. Support County Authority to Collect Existing Sales Tax: NACo supports legislation to permit the collection of existing sales and use taxes from remote sellers. The issue of collecting remote sales taxes has taken on greater significance in recent years due to the Internet's growth as a retail marketplace. As a result, state and local governments have lost billions in uncollected sales taxes and Main Street businesses and themselves at a significant competitive disadvantage to online merchants. This disadvantage is amplified because online merchants and their customers use and benefit from local infrastructure and services without contributing to their provision.

vii. Support Programs that Assist Counties to Prevent and Reduce Poverty: NACo supports federal investments and strategies that focus on serving those most in need and the root causes of poverty. Because counties are responsible to maintain the local social safety net and are typically mandated to provide indigent care, NACo supports fully funding programs that assist our nation's most vulnerable populations and maintain the maximum amount of flexibility possible at the local level. Key federal programs that assist counties in tackling poverty include the Social Services Block Grant and the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families program.

viii. Support a Comprehensive Long-Term Farm Bill Reauthorization: NACo supports a long-term reauthorization of the farm bill to help counties provide critical investments in our nation's most underserved communities. In addition to a long-term reauthorization, NACo also supports full funding for all farm bill titles, which help strengthen our nation's rural infrastructure including broadband and water and wastewater systems, protect our nation's food supply, increase access to healthy food to low-income populations through the Supplemental Nutritional Assistance Program (SNAP), and promote environmental stewardship and conservation.

<u>Tuesday, March 6, 2018</u>

1) Federal Transit Administration meeting:

   a. Honolulu City Council Permitted Interaction Group met with the Federal Transit Administration regarding the Honolulu Rail Project. Please see attached Council Communication 105 for details of this meeting:

   b. http://www4.honolulu.gov/docushare/dsweb/Get/Document-204841/CC-105(18).PDF

2) HSAC Congressional Delegation meetings:

   a. HSAC members met with Senators Maizie Hirono and Brian Schatz and Representatives Colleen Hanabusa and Tulsi Gabbard to discuss various federal issues and concerns facing each of the Counties of Hawaii.

i. Kauai
    1. Passed GET tax increase
    2. Federal Shearwater bird issues
ii. Maui
    1. Maui MPO designation?
    2. Federal Farm bill? Water implications and sewer funds
    3. Cesspool conversions
iii. Hawaii Island
    1. Invasive species
    2. Cesspool conversions
iv. Honolulu
    1. Red Hill fuel storage
    2. Federal infrastructure program: 80-20 split reversal
    3. Federal Tax plan proposals
    4. Increased military budget caps
    5. Waikane valley military exercises

Form CCLTRVL03(06/07)
(revised 11/10)

City Council
City and County of Honolulu

CLAIM FOR TRAVEL REIMBURSEMENT

Date: April 27, 2018

Traveler: Councilmember Ikaika Anderson

Event: NACo 2018 Legislative Conference

Location: Washington D.C.

Dates: From March ~~X~~ 3, 2018 To March ~~X~~ 7 2018

Description	Amount	Notes:
1. Registration Fee	~~400.00~~	
2. Airfare	193.30 ✓	Flight cancellation and new booking o/w JFK-IAD
3. Hotel	~~1636.77~~ 1611.45 ✓	
4. Meals	~~230.18~~ 339.18 ✓	
5. Ground Transportation	~~36.37~~ 48.03 ✓	
6. Tips	36.78 ✓	
7. Other	24.66 ✓	Long distance phone charge
Other		
Other		
8. Adjustment	(161.40) ✓ (1210.00) ✓	airfare cancellation credited to personal credit card r/t JFK-IAD HSAC hotel reimbursement
TOTAL REIMBURSEMENT	~~2043.4~~ 792.00 ✓	
Ikaika's portion	~~885.00~~	

This is to certify that the above data, based upon receipts submitted to Council Administrative Support Services via a CCLTRVL02 form, is accurate. Further, I am claiming reimbursement for expenses associated with a trip in which City business was conducted and personal funds were used to advance payment.

Signature of Traveler

April 27, 2018

Date